

REMARKS

This is a full and timely response to the final Office Action mailed April 3, 2008. Reconsideration and allowance of the application and presently pending claims are respectfully requested.

Telephone Conversation With Examiners

Examiner Recek and Supervisory Examiner Caldwell are thanked for the telephone conversation conducted on June 11, 2008. Proposed claim amendments were discussed. Issues related to 35 U.S.C. § 101 were discussed. No agreements were reached.

Present Status of Patent Application

Claims 1, 3-17, and 19-56 are currently pending. Of these pending claims, claims 4, 5, 7-10, 13, 17, 34-43, and 45-48 are original unamended claims; claims 1, 6, 11, 12, 14, 15, 19, 24-26, 31, 33, 44, and 49 have been currently amended without introduction of new matter; and claims 3, 16, 20-23, 27-30, 32, and 50-56 have been previously presented. Reconsideration and allowance of the application and presently pending claims are respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103

I. Statement of the Rejection

Claims 1, 4-6, 10, 13, 16-17, 19-21, 23-30 and 49-56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Masumoto et al. U.S. Pat. 6,943,752 B2 in view of Parsons, Jr. et al. US 6,349,337 B1 and in further view of Dunlap et al. Us 6,760,749 B1.

Response to the Rejection

Claim 1

In rejecting Applicants' claim 1, the Office action justifies combining Matsumoto with Parsons and Dunlap by asserting that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to do so because of certain alleged advantages. Applicants respectfully disagree with the Office action assertion and hereby traverse the rejection. However,

in the interests of moving forward prosecution in the case, Applicants have opted to currently amend claim 1 and respectfully assert that the cited prior art, individually and/or in combination fails to reasonably teach or disclose various portions of the amended claim.

For example, a first of such portions, cites: “*discovering in the sender device, at least one of a plurality of alternate display devices by using a meeting room multimoon (MRM) service comprising one of (A) a wireless Universal Plug and Play (UPnP) search or (B) listening for a wireless advertisement by the at least one of the alternate display devices.*” This aspect has been described by Applicants in their original specification (for example, in paragraphs [0103] to [0106]). The combination of Matsumoto, Parsons and Dunlap fails to suggest or teach this first portion of the claim.

Amended claim 1 further includes, in pertinent part: “... *establishing comprising generation of a ticket that provides information on how to connect to the sender device*” (emphasis added). This aspect (generation of a ticket), which is also not reasonably taught or disclosed in the prior art, has been described by Applicants in various sections of their specification – paragraph [0106] and Fig. 5, for example.

In light of the remarks above, Applicants respectfully submit that amended claim 1 is allowable over the cited art and hereby request withdrawal of the rejection followed by allowance of the claim.

Claims 3-17

Applicants respectfully submit that claims 3-17 are allowable for several reasons. One among these several reasons arises from the fact that these claims are each dependent on claim 1, which is allowable for reasons provided above. Consequently, claims 3-17 are also allowable by law arising from claim dependency. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection followed by allowance of these claims.

Claim 19

The Office action rejects claim 19 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) by alleging that this claim corresponds to claim 1. Applicants respectfully traverse this allegation. As one among several examples, claim 19 includes: “*displaying a user interface on the computing device.*” As is

apparent in contrast, claim 1 does not cite such a claim element.

Notwithstanding the impropriety of the rejection, Applicants have opted to currently amend claim 19 in order to move forward prosecution in the case. As a result, claim 19 now includes: “...*the establishing comprising generation of a ticket that provides information on how to connect to the computing device.*” Such a ticket is not reasonably taught or disclosed, individually or combinedly, in the cited prior art. Consequently, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 19 is allowable and hereby request withdrawal of the rejection followed by allowance of this claim.

Claims 20-21 and 23-30

Applicants respectfully traverse the Office action allegation that claims 20-21 and 23-30 correspond to other pending claims and are therefore rejected for the same reasons. For example, the Office action alleges that claims 23 and 24 correspond to claims 9 and 8. However, it can be seen that claim 23 includes the term “*altering*” whereas claim 9 cites “*authoring*.” Similarly, a comparison between other claims reveals further such differences. The Office action fails to provide a detailed and adequate explanation as to how the cited prior art discloses such claim elements.

Notwithstanding the impropriety of the rejection, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 20, 21, and 23-30 are allowable for several reasons. One among these several reasons arises from the fact that these claims are each dependent on claim 19, which is allowable for reasons provided above. Consequently, claims 20, 21, and 23-30 are also allowable by law arising from claim dependency. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection followed by allowance of these claims.

Claim 49

The Office action rejects claim 49 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) by alleging that this claim corresponds to claim 19. Applicants respectfully traverse this allegation. However, Applicants have opted to currently amend claim 49 in order to move forward prosecution in the case. As a result, claim 49 now includes: “...*means for discovering the at least one client display device by receiving a wireless “available for discovery” signal transmitted by the at least one client*

display device.” Applicants have described this aspect in various portions of their specification, for example in their paragraph [0111]. Such a feature is not reasonably taught or disclosed, individually or combinedly, in the cited prior art. Consequently, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 49 is allowable and hereby request withdrawal of the rejection followed by allowance of this claim.

Claims 50-56

Applicants respectfully traverse the Office action allegation that claims 50-56 are substantially similar to claims 20-21, 23-24 and 27-29 and are therefore rejected for the same reasons. The Office action fails to provide a proper justification for such an allegation.

Notwithstanding the impropriety of the rejection, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 50-56 are allowable for several reasons. One among these several reasons arises from the fact that these claims are each dependent on claim 49, which is allowable for reasons provided above. Consequently, claims 50-56 are also allowable by law arising from claim dependency. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection followed by allowance of these claims.

II. Statement of the Rejection

Claims 7-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Masumoto, Parsons and Dunlap in view of Orfitelli et al. U.S. 6,904,451 B1.

Response to the Rejection

Claims 7-9

In rejecting Applicants’ claim 7, the Office action alleges that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Masumoto by adding a second user interface as taught by Orfitelli because it would “*allow the presenter to quickly and easily modify the presentation data without retreating to a laptop or other computing device (i.e. server) that may be positioned across the room.*” Applicants respectfully traverse this allegation and submit that while it may be reasonable to expect that a presenter can use a second user interface for controlling a presentation (e.g. moving forward slides in a slideshow), it is

unreasonable to allege that one of ordinary skill in the art would use a second user interface for the purposes of carrying out an authoring process that includes designating of at least one portion of the content as private data. In this matter, Applicants presume that the Office action allegation has been made without using legally impermissible hindsight gained from Applicants' own disclosure.

Notwithstanding the remarks above, Applicants respectfully assert that claims 7-9 are at least allowable due to their indirect dependency from allowable claim 1. Consequently, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection followed by allowance of these claims.

III. Statement of the Rejection

Claims 11-12 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Masumoto, Parsons and Dunlap in view of Zhang et al. "Software Solution to Completely Wireless Presentation" 2001.

Response to the Rejection

Claims 11-12 and 32

In rejecting Applicants' claim 11, the Office action alleges that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Masumoto by providing another user interface, so as "*to project a clear image of the content.*" The Office action fails to explain how this rationale (clear image) bears relevance to Applicants' claim 11. Therefore, Applicants respectfully traverse the reasons provided for combining the cited prior art.

Nonetheless, Applicants respectfully assert that claims 11-12 and 32 are at least allowable due to their indirect dependency from allowable claims 1 and 19 respectively. Consequently, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection followed by allowance of these claims.

IV. Statement of the Rejection

Claims 33-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zhang in view of Masumoto and in view of Parsons Jr.

Response to the Rejection

Claim 33

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection as well as the reasons provided in the Office action for combining the prior art. However, Applicants have opted to currently amend claim 33 in order to move forward prosecution in the case. As a result, claim 33 now includes: “...*means for discovering the at least one client display device by receiving a wireless “available for discovery” signal transmitted by the at least one client display device.*” Applicants have described this aspect in various portions of their specification, for example in their paragraph [0111]. Such a feature is not reasonably taught or disclosed, individually or combinedly, in the cited prior art. Consequently, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 33 is allowable and hereby request withdrawal of the rejection followed by allowance of this claim.

Claims 34-43

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of these claims as well as the reasons provided in the Office action for combining the prior art in doing so. Nonetheless, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 34-43 are allowable at least allowable due to claim dependency from allowable claim 33. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection followed by allowance of these claims.

Claim 44

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection as well as the reasons provided in the Office action for combining the prior art. However, Applicants have opted to currently amend claim 44 in order to move forward prosecution in the case. As a result, claim 44 now includes: “...*means for discovering the at least one client display device by receiving a wireless “available for discovery” signal transmitted by the at least one client display device.*” Such a feature is not reasonably taught or disclosed, individually or combinedly, in the cited prior art. Consequently, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 44 is allowable and hereby request withdrawal of the rejection followed by allowance of this claim.

Claims 45-48

Applicants respectfully traverse the Office action allegation that claims 45-48 are substantially similar to claims 36-37, 40 and 43 and are therefore rejected for the same reasons. The Office action fails to provide a proper justification for such an allegation.

Notwithstanding the impropriety of the rejection, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 45-48 are allowable for several reasons. One among these several reasons arises from the fact that these claims are each dependent on claim 44, which is allowable for reasons provided above. Consequently, claims 45-48 are also allowable by law arising from claim dependency. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection followed by allowance of these claims.

V. Statement of the Rejection

Claims 14-15 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Masumoto, Parsons and Dunlap.

Response to the Rejection

Claims 14-15 and 31

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection as well as the reasons provided in the Office action for combining the cited prior art. Notwithstanding the impropriety of the rejection, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 14-15 and 31 are allowable for several reasons. One among these several reasons arises from the fact that these claims are each dependent on claims 1 and 19 respectively, both of which are allowable for reasons provided above. Consequently, claims 14-15 and 31 are also allowable by law arising from claim dependency. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection followed by allowance of these claims.

VI. Statement of the Rejection

Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Masumoto, Parsons, Dunlap and in view of Acharya et al. US 2005/0036509 A1.

Response to the Rejection

Claim 22

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection as well as the reasons provided in the Office action for combining the cited prior art. Notwithstanding the impropriety of the rejection, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 22 is allowable for several reasons. One among these several reasons arises from the fact that this claim is indirectly dependent on claim 19, which is allowable for reasons provided above. Consequently, claim 22 is also allowable by law arising from claim dependency. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection followed by allowance of this claim.

Cited Art Made of Record

The prior art made of record has been considered, but is not believed to affect the patentability of the presently pending claims.

DOCKET NO.: MSFT-3501/300585.03
Application No.: 10/786,313
Office Action Dated: April 3, 2008

PATENT
REPLY FILED PURSUANT TO
37 CFR § 1.116

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that pending claims are allowable. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application and all pending claims are hereby court-cously requested. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephonic conference would expedite the examination of this matter, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned representative.

Date: June 24, 2008

/Joseph F. Oriti/
Joseph F. Oriti
Registration No. 47,835

Woodcock Washburn LLP
Cira Centre
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439